

MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
May 7, 2003
Gaylord, Michigan

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present

Thomas Wieszorek, Vice Chairman
Richard Duell, Member
Bill McEntee, Member
Steve Warren, Member
Aaron Hopper, Member

Susan Mortel, Member
John Elzinga, Member
Kirk Stuedle, Member
John Kolessar, Member

Absent

Carmine Palombo, Chairman

Staff Present

Rick Lilly, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Zoe Lorca, Bureau of Transportation Planning
Ron Vibbert, Bureau of Transportation Planning

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:15 at the Best Western Hotel in Gaylord, Michigan.

Approval of the April 2, 2003 Minutes

Richard Deuell moved approval of the minutes as submitted. It was supported by Aaron Hopper. The minutes were approved unanimously as submitted.

Correspondence and Announcements

Mr. Lilly announced that Pat Lockwood, Commission Advisor would be absent from the meeting and that she sends her regrets. Mr. Lilly informed the Council that their 2005 budget would be heard before a Senate committee on Thursday, March 8, 2003.

Committee Reports

All of the Council subcommittees had met during the month of April.

Administrative & Outreach Committee: The Administrative and Outreach Committee met and discussed the revised budget figures. The presentation on the budget was given later in the meeting by Mr. Lilly.

Data Committee: Mr. McEntee gave the report for the Data Committee. He reported that they met and finished work on the final results of the data collection survey. They discussed the issue of “functionally obsolete bridges” that had been referred back to them by the Council. It was the committee’s recommendation that functionally obsolete bridges not be included in the reporting of data collection.

Strategic Analysis Committee: Mr. Warren made the report for the Strategic Analysis Committee. The committee also informed the Council that preparations for data collection are continuing. The committee also discussed the needs for a potential strategic planning model. Some of the variables and needs required to select a model include:

- How the model measures needs versus performance
- The model must have a predictive function
- The model should have the capability of evaluating statewide and local conditions
- The Council staff will put together a matrix of various forecast models which include items such as data required and any additional data needed to run the various modeling programs
- The committee feels that they will need to make sure that the model that is chosen will identify the fixes that a human engineer would also choose to use.
- It was also decided that the model should be tested by having local engineers look at the various scenarios produced and decide if they are feasible

Monthly Report

Mr. Lilly reported on the activities that had taken place during the month of April. In April, the Asset Management Council Annual Report was sent to the Legislature and the Transportation Commission well in advance of the May 2, 2003, deadline. The Annual Report only included data from the pilot project as full data collection and integration will not begin until August of this year. The first quarter report was sent out to key stakeholders. The data collection survey has been completed and the data has been analyzed.

With regard to the work plan, all of the items except the development of a procedures manual are on track. The staff is working on steps of how to create this document. Ms. Mortel asked if the committee’s needed to provide guidance to the staff regarding the manual. Mr. Lilly responded that the staff needed to put together all of the various procedures that needed to be followed and then have it reviewed by the committees. In

response to Ms. Mortel's question Mr. Lilly indicated that the Administrative Committee would do with this and that it should be ready for the training sessions.

It was moved by Mr. Kolessar that the April monthly report be received; supported by Mr. Deuell. Motion passed unanimously.

Budget Adjustments

Mr. Lilly presented a revised budget to the Council. He pointed out that the data collection cost represents two-thirds of the budget, all of which will go to the regional planning agencies. Each county agency will contract with the Regional Planning Agencies for data collection. This will avoid the Council having to create and pass 83 separate contracts, one for each county in Michigan. The initial budget had \$74,000 set aside for equipment purchases. The equipment has been purchased and the total is \$51,000 which is a savings of \$23,000. Vehicle costs will be higher than the original budgeted amount, because the initial amount for data collection was based on an assumption which did not include ramps and assessing both sides of divided highways. For completing the 3 year plan, regional planning agencies will be given \$500 per contact required to create the three year plan. Local agencies will be reimbursed for their actual costs. They will be required to keep accurate records and document all expenses. The Council needs to approve this version of the budget so MDOT can amend the unified work programs with local agencies.

Mr. Kolessar asked how much the vehicle costs had been under budgeted. Mr. Lilly responded that it would require an additional \$4,000 for all the necessary vehicles.

Mr. Warren asked Mr. Lilly to clarify the position that one-third of the data collection costs goes to MDOT. He asked if MDOT was being reimbursed for items that the counties would not be reimbursed for. Mr. Lilly responded that MDOT would receive one-third, the counties would receive one third and the regions would receive one third. So no agency was getting any more or less than any other. All agencies would charge for data collection. Mr. Warren asked that the staff to the Council create guidelines for the counties. Mr. Lilly agreed to do this.

Mr. Warren then asked if the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) would be contracting with the regional planning commissions as well. Mr. Lilly said that agreements will have to be worked out between the regions and the MPOs. He did point out that the MPOs would be the most logical agency to develop the three year plan since they are already required to create a three year plan under federal law.

Mr. Duell expressed his concern that local agencies might be held to the three year plans produced and that was not always feasible. Mr. Lilly said that local agencies would not be

liable for projects outside of the three year plan or three year plan projects which were not undertaken.

Mr. Duell asked if the local agencies invoices would be audited before they would get paid for data collection. Mr. Lilly responded that they would be reviewed by staff before being sent to Finance for payment

Mr. Elsinga moved that the amended budget be approved; supported by Mr. Deuell. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Mr. Lilly then went over some areas of the budget where costs would not likely be incurred as originally adopted. Since the annual report and other items were not printed for distribution but sent electronically, the savings on that budget item was \$5,000. Since a data processing agency is not likely to be hired before the end of the fiscal year (October 1, 2003), the funds for that budget item could be spent elsewhere.

Mr. Lilly also discussed the issue of travel. Those Council members who wish to travel to the Asset Management Conference in Atlanta, Georgia and Seattle, Washington will have to be approved to travel by the director. Ms. Lockwood and Mr. Lilly will be putting together a request for the director's approval. Mr. Lilly reminded the Council that Michigan has been asked to do a break out session about our program at these national conventions.

Roadsoft Update

Mr. Lilly briefed the Council on the latest developments regarding the Roadsoft and LTAP contracts.

- The critical issue in the discussions centered on who owned the software. It has been determined that Michigan Tech owns it and that they will grant a nonexclusive, worldwide license to the department.
- The Roadsoft contract will be brought before the Governor's Administrative Board on May 20.
- The university will be reimbursed for the work they have done on RoadSoft since January of 2003.

Ms. Mortel asked when a data processing and storage agency would be chosen and which committee would be dealing with that issue. Mr. Lilly said that the administrative committee will solicit requests for proposal for a data agency. He continued saying that the discussion of the parameters of the data agency is one which must begin at the administrative committee who will make their recommendations to the full Council. Mr. Stuedle felt that this was also an issue which the data committee should address. Ms. Mortel asked if the regions were aware that they would be storing the data. Mr. Lilly responded that yes they did. Ms. Mortel asked if the Council was going to pay for this

activity. Mr. Lilly responded, yes.

Mr. McEntee asked Mr. Lilly to describe the MDOT staffing of data collection. Mr. Lilly said that MDOT would be contracting engineering temps to do surveying as well as contracting with those who worked on the pilot project.

He said that the Asset Management Council staff needed to begin the training process and would like a list of road commission representatives who will be participating in the data gathering. He said that he has instructed the regional planning organizations to notify the county road commissions for those names.

Survey Presentation

Mr. McEntee gave a presentation on the results of the data collection survey. The survey showed that of those responding who use a pavement management system the vast majority are using PASER and RoadSoft.

Ms. Mortel asked if the survey had distinguished between data collection and data processing. Mr. Elzinga noted that since road commissions are only charged with the roads they had a much higher response rate with regard to actually collecting road condition data. He said that because cities and townships also have to contend with sewers, police, fire and other issues, it is much harder for them to devote the resources necessary to collect road condition data.

Public Comment

Mr. Ron Young, Alcona County Road Commission, noted that there was a ton of data on bridges and he hoped the Council was not going to collect additional data. He also wondered if rural minor collectors were going to be included. Mr. Lilly indicated that yes they would. He was also concerned about the idea of having to publish a 3 year road work program because the funding from local sources was not always known that far in advance.

Mr. Lilly responded that his concern was recognized and understood and the program would reflect that. He stated that the multi-year program is more of an investment report than an actual work program. He noted that there is nothing in the legislation where cities and county road commissions would not be held to doing those projects. Mr. Warren added that in Kent County, they put together a five year plan that simply identified an investment level using projects as examples rather than a specific strategy.

Mr. James Lehman, Saginaw County Road Commission, asked if the 3 year plan would include local roads. Mr. Lilly responded that it would not at this time. It will cover just the federal aid eligible roads.

Having no further public comment the meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.